



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTES

A SOURCE-BOOK OF JUDAISM IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES¹

When the Bible is regarded only as a book of authoritative revelation concerning religious practice or belief, the chief interest men will have in non-canonical Jewish or Christian books is that they be recognized as such and excluded from the canon. Books so excluded will always be neglected, and were in early times in danger of being lost altogether. When Protestantism denied authority to the Apocrypha, that is to the books and parts of books of the Catholic Vulgate which were not in the Jewish canon of the Old Testament, these books inevitably fell out of popular use, though they were recommended at first as useful books to read. Even the Revised Version of the Apocrypha (1895) has failed, certainly in our own country, to bring them again to public attention. But when the Bible is used as a collection of historical sources, and the effort is made to understand the history of Israel's religious and moral development from the beginning to the rise of Christianity, and to understand Christianity itself in the light of its historical sources and environment, then the significance of canonicity fades away. The historian wants all the literary products and records of the period he is studying; and the historian of the rise of Christianity has a peculiar interest in the events and movements in Judaism just before and during the lives of Jesus and the first disciples. He turns first of all to the Apocrypha as likely to contain the Jewish books which, after the canon, had the greatest popularity and were probably most representative of current opinion. The Apocrypha as a collection is ultimately due to the fact that the Greek Old Testament of Hellenistic Jews contained a number of additional books of similar character to those of the third part of the Hebrew canon, the Hagiographa, books, that is, of history, story, poetry, and wisdom. The presence of these additional books in the Septuagint indicates that the exact limits of the canon were not yet rigidly fixed in Palestine in New Testament times;

¹ *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. In English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Edited in conjunction with many scholars, by R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. 2 vols. £3 3s. net (\$19.25).

and since most of the books of our Apocrypha were written in Hebrew, there is every reason to suppose that they were known and valued in Palestine as well as in Egypt. But the Apocrypha was not a fixed collection. Manuscripts of the Septuagint and other Greek texts contain some other books besides those which, through the Latin, happen to compose our Apocrypha. The Latin contained one important book (II Esdras) which is not extant in Greek. Other Christian churches, Syrian, Ethiopic, Coptic, Armenian, preserved still other Jewish books, chiefly of an apocalyptical and legendary character, and of pseudonymous form. In early Christian lists the names of many such books are given. To them the title *apocrypha*, "hidden books," originally and properly belonged. They were books concerning mysteries, perhaps primarily the esoteric books of secret sects. The canonical Hagiographa, however, contains one such, the Book of Daniel (165 B.C.), which may be regarded as starting, or as newly starting, the production of apocalyptical writings. The two or three centuries with which we are dealing were prolific in writings of this kind, and a high value was put upon them in certain circles (cf. II Esdras 14:44-47). Many disappeared altogether. Of those named in Christian lists several are not otherwise known. From some, early Christian writers give citations. Some have survived, whether because they were most used and valued, or through the chance preservation and discovery of a single manuscript.

In regard to writings of this sort, which make up the larger part of the second volume, the Pseudepigrapha, of the edition before us, scholarly opinions differ as to composition, date, place, and the vital question whether they represent the ruling type of Judaism, or belong to special sects, Essenic or other, or narrow and peculiar circles. The latter is the opinion of many Jewish scholars, who maintain that the best sources for a knowledge of Judaism proper even in New Testament times are to be found in the Talmud and other Hebrew and Aramaic writings of the rabbis, although as writings they date from about 200 A.D. down to the early Middle Ages. This rabbinical literature in fact records traditions that reach far back. It has, moreover, the undoubted right to be regarded as the product and record of the prevailing character and movement of the Jewish religion in the post-exilic, and especially in the post-Maccabean, period. The student of Judaism in New Testament times cannot safely neglect this literature, however discouraging he may find the reading of it, and however hard it may be to distinguish in it the early and the late, and especially to get behind the effects of

the end of the temple and of the political independence of Judaism (70-135 A.D.). The volumes before us contain one small though important bit of this literature, one of the sixty-three books of the Mishna, the *Pirke Aboth*, or Sayings of the Fathers. The Mishna (200 A.D.) is a systematic arrangement, exposition, and elaboration of the Pentateuchal laws. It must be regarded as the result of the principal work of the principal Jewish teachers for many generations. We know the names of the most important scribes whose work it is (the *Tanaim*), and from this and other sources we know something about their teachings and personalities. There can be no doubt that the reading of the Mishna and of proper selections—especially of haggadic material—from the Talmud, the Targums, and the Midrashim, including the earliest Jewish prayers and liturgies, is an indispensable means of learning to think and feel as the Jews of Palestine, and especially as the scribes and Pharisees of Judea, did in the time of Jesus and Paul.

But Hellenistic Judaism belongs also to the historical background and environment, if not directly of Jesus, yet of Paul and the New Testament; and for Hellenistic Judaism our available sources are many and extensive. Some, of course, are included in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, for the Septuagint was the sacred book of Hellenistic Judaism. But apart from this we possess, entire or in fragments, historical, philosophical, apologetic, and poetic works of Egyptian Jews, and above all most of the many works of Philo of Alexandria (about 20 B.C.—40 A.D.), who has his large place in the history both of the Jewish religion and of Greek philosophy. Then there is Josephus (about 37-105 A.D.), the historian on whom we depend for our knowledge of the course of events amid which Christianity arose. His significance for the student of New Testament times can be briefly indicated in the words of Hausrath: "Our task is to see the circumstances described by Josephus with the eyes of the Evangelists, and from their experiences to complete them; and also to read the narratives of the Gospels in connection with the historical circumstances described by Josephus." In order to complete even so brief a sketch of our sources for Judaism in New Testament times it is necessary to add three remarks. In the first place the Old Testament, and pre-eminently the Pentateuch, was the authoritative canon of all Jews in this period. Judaism was the religion of a book. It was divided into many sects, but all acknowledged the same Torah, the same revealed will of God. The Mishna was the result of the study of the Pentateuch by Judean rabbis. Philo's two principal works were an allegorical commentary on a part of the Pen-

tateuch, and a systematic treatment of the Mosaic laws. Josephus not only retells the sacred history, but attempts to set forth the law in systematic form. Paul and others must adjust the new gospel to the same sacred text. The second remark is that the New Testament itself is the most important source of the Judaism of its own time, and though it receives much light from other sources, it gives still more than it receives. John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul, and the authors of Hebrews, the Fourth Gospel, and the Revelation, witness to Judaism both by what they receive and approve, and by what they reject and oppose.

The third remark is that the relations between Christians and Jews during the first two centuries, but especially until the Bar Cochba movement (132-135 A.D.), continued to be close. In the region of apocalyptical literature it has to be recognized that the line between Jewish and Christian authorship is hard to draw. There are in the volumes before us Jewish books in Christian revisions. Perhaps the New Testament Apocalypse can be so described. There can be no doubt that much can be learned about Judaism from the Christian Apocrypha contained in Vols. VIII and IX of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. The Didache may contain a Jewish book, the Two Ways, and witness to another region of close contact between Christians and Jews. The influence of Greek mystery cults upon Christianity may have been mediated through Judaism. The question whether a Jewish Gnosticism prepared the way for the Christian is indeed obscure. The fact that the Odes of Solomon impress many scholars as Jewish originals indicates at least the difficulty of the question how far Judaism was then developing mystical sects. Professor Moore has recently shown that the official closing of the Jewish canon was due to the attraction which the Gospels and perhaps other Christian books exerted even in rabbinical circles in the second century. Harnack has just set forth freshly the importance of Justin's Dialogue with Trypho (= R. Tarphon?), as a source for Judaism early in the second century.¹

It is in the light of this general survey of the historical sources of Judaism in New Testament times that we can best give its right place to the collection before us. Here we have the chief surviving Jewish *apocrypha*, in the wider sense of that word; that is, the books of our own "Apocrypha" and other books extant in Greek or other versions, which Christians valued and kept after Jews had let them go;

¹ The close relationship between Judaism and Christianity has been comprehensively treated by Hoennicke in his *Das Judenchristentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert* (1908).

books, for the most part, which stood at least some chance, in some circles, because of age, popularity, or express claim, of gaining a place among the sacred Scriptures of Judaism and then of Christianity. There are, however, a few books to which neither this description nor the title Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha can properly be applied. Since these volumes will not be at everyone's hand I give below their contents, rearranging the books in approximately chronological order, and indicating the distinction between books believed by the editors to have been written in Hebrew or Aramaic, and those written in Greek, a distinction which is important though in some cases uncertain.

The first and the last word of the reviewer of these significant volumes ought to be one of praise and gratitude, and the principal word between might well be one of exhortation to ministers and other students of the Bible to get and use this collection. We have here together, in English translation on the basis of a critical text, with sufficient and reliable introductions and explanatory notes, the books to which the student of the New Testament turns first, after the Old Testament, in his effort to understand the Judaism out of which Christianity came.

For the English text of the Apocrypha we are told that "in a few cases the Revised Version has been adopted and emendations suggested in the notes." We are left to discover for ourselves that the R.V. is followed in I Esdras, Judith, and Baruch (except for poetic arrangement); that it is altered only very occasionally in Wisdom; that it is more thoroughly revised in I and II Maccabees, Prayer of Manasses, and Additions to Esther; that Tobit is a rendering of the Sinaitic text, in place of the Vatican and Alexandrian which R.V. follows; and that Sirach has a wholly new version, based on the Hebrew so far as it is extant. Canon Charles, the general editor, contributes condensations—the complete text, with abridged introductions and notes—of his well-known editions of Jubilees, Martyrdom of Isaiah (the Jewish part of the Ascension of Isaiah), I and II Enoch, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Assumption of Moses, and the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. In the case of II Enoch the translation from the Slavonic by Morfill, who died in 1909, is replaced by a new version by Mr. Forbes. A line in explanation of this would have been welcome. Dr. Charles also edits the Fragments of a Zadokite Work, separately printed in 1912. Mr. G. H. Box's IV Ezra is a condensation of his admirable edition, *The Ezra-Apocalypse*, 1912. The Story of Ahikar is a reprint from the edition of 1898, in convenient parallel columns, of the translations from Syriac, Arabic, and Armenian, and adds the recently discovered

CRITICAL NOTES

III

HEBREW OR ARAMAIC ORIGINALS				GREEK ORIGINALS		
	Title	Date	Editor	Title	Date	Editor
Before 200 B.C.	Story of Ahiqar.....	500	Harris, Lewis, Cony- beare			
	Ep. of Jeremy.....	before 300	C. J. Ball			
200-100 B.C.	Tobit.....	350-170	D. C. Simpson			
	Sirach.....	180-175	G. H. Box and W. O. E. Oesterley			
	Enoch.....	before 170 to 64	Charles			
	Judith.....	150	A. E. Cowley	Aristeas.....	130-70	H. T. Andrews
	Bel and Dragon.....	136	T. W. Davies			
	I Maccabees.....	125-100	Oesterley	Sibylline Oracles (Jew- ish parts).....	? 125-50	H. C. O. Lanchester J. Moffatt
	Jubilees.....	109-105	Charles	II Maccabees.....	about 100	C. W. Emmet
	Testaments of XII Pa- triarchs.....	before 100	Charles	III Maccabees.....		
	I Esdras.....	? 95-80	S. A. Cook			
	Susanna.....	63-48	D. M. Kay			
100-1 B.C.	Psalms of Solomon.....	? 18 B.C.—70 A.D.	G. B. Gray	Wisdom of Solomon.....	50-10	S. Holmes
	Prayer of Azariah and Song of Three.....		W. H. Bennett	IV Maccabees.....	63 B.C.—38 A.D.	R. B. Townshend
	Fragments of Zadokite Work.....		Charles	II Enoch (Secrets).....	30 B.C.—70 A.D.	Charles and N. Forbes
				Add. Esther.....	? 78	J. A. F. Gregg
1-100 A.D.	Assumption of Moses.....	7-29	Charles			
	Martyrdom of Isaiah.....	? 78	Charles	I Baruch 4 ^s -5 ^s		O. C. Whitehouse
	I Baruch 1 ^s -4 ^s	after 70 (about 100)	O. C. Whitehouse			
100-200 A.D.	II Baruch.....	about 100 (before 132)	Charles	Books of Adam and Eve.....	? ?	L. S. A. Wells
	IV Ezra.....		Box			
	(IIEsdras, chap. 3-14)			III Baruch (Greek Apocalypse) Prayer of Manasses.....	? ?	H. M. Hughes H. E. Ryle

Aramaic text, of about 400 B.C., which pushes the date of the book back two or three hundred years, and indicates, probably, non-Jewish authorship. Other books in the volume of Pseudepigrapha and all the Apocrypha proper are edited freshly for this work.

For twenty years past the student in this field has been in ever-increasing and quite incalculable debt to Dr. Charles—now Canon of Westminster—the general editor of these volumes. One can have only sincere and grateful admiration for his untiring industry and amazing productivity in this obscure and difficult region of research. There is an intellectual and spiritual energy behind such labors that is our wonder and despair.

It is natural to compare this collection with the two volumes of Kautzsch's similar German work (1900), after which this is patterned. "On a smaller scale than the present work and embracing fewer books of this literature"; "the best work that has hitherto appeared on this literature as a whole, but many parts of it are already antiquated": these are Canon Charles's characterizations of it. The new work is not quite so uniform in its scale and manner of treatment as the old, and not quite so consistently adapted to a definite use. Kautzsch aimed to make the results of criticism accessible to the general reader. The work of Charles is adapted to that purpose so far as it is an abridgment of more elaborate editions; but the treatment as a whole is more technical. Simpson's elaborate textual apparatus for the Book of Tobit belongs to an edition of the Sinaitic Greek text, not to a translation of it, and is useful only to the student with the Greek text before him. Box and Oesterley's Sirach could well have appeared as a separate volume, and a condensation of it in the present work. It occupies more than a third of the first volume, and is the most important contribution which these volumes make to the scholar's equipment, worthily filling an empty place in English literature since the discovery of the Hebrew texts. In this case the separate commentary by Oesterley (*Cambridge Bible*, 1912) is the shorter and more popular treatment.

If the intention was to make this literature more accessible to the average minister and student of the Bible, it should if possible have been more briefly and simply edited, and less sumptuously printed. For I must venture to descend to the homely subject of price, because this, more than the somewhat technical treatment, will, I fear, set bounds to its usefulness. Kautzsch costs 19 marks, and can be had by those who have an interest in it. Canon Charles tells us that "the greater part of these books [the Pseudepigrapha] have hitherto been

accessible only in expensive editions." In fact the seven volumes by Charles already mentioned, together with the separate printing of his *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Box's *Ezra-Apocalypse*, Ryle and James's *Psalms of the Pharisees*, Taylor's *Sayings of the Fathers*, eleven volumes in all, are listed at \$35.80. The cost of the present work is, in England, £3 3s., and in America—because of the urgent preference of our government that we buy instead of this an equal weight, thirteen pounds, of American-made books—\$19.25. Special students who have the separate editions must have this also; since, although it is made up in part of condensations of these, it contains also many wholly new and important editions. But I fear that it will seem out of the reach of the majority of those who would be interested to possess it. Would it not have been a feasible plan to have continued the publication of separate editions, in which, owing chiefly to Dr. Charles, English literature is already so far advanced; and in such a general collection as this to aim to reach a wider circle and encourage a more general reading of this literature? Such an edition, with briefer introductions and notes, cheaper paper, and smaller type, might have made room, within smaller compass, for a still more complete collection of texts, something more nearly approaching the ideal of a source-book of Judaism in the New Testament period.

It will I fear seem ungracious and useless now that this great work is before us to express the wish that it might have been in some respects different. But perhaps it may help rather than hinder the right use of the book as it is, to point out its limitations. It is of course inadvertently that the preface prefixed to each volume states that "Volume II contains all the remaining extant non-canonical Jewish books [in addition to the Apocrypha of Volume I] written between 200 B.C. and 100 A.D., with possibly one or two exceptions." This not only leaves no place for the two most voluminous Jewish writers of antiquity, Philo and Josephus, but it unfortunately gives the impression that we have here all the documents that are to be taken into account in the study of Judaism in New Testament times. How very far this is from being the case is evident from the survey of the literary records of Judaism with which this article begins. One need only read Schürer's discussion of sources in Volume I of his *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, and of Palestinian and Hellenistic Jewish literature in Volume V, to realize how much more the student has to reckon with.

Dr. Charles's selection is in fact nearly the same as that of Kautzsch. The two first volumes contain the same fifteen books. The second volume of Charles, the Pseudepigrapha, contains seventeen books,

four more than that of Kautzsch; but of the four only one is a pseud-epigraph, the *Secrets of Enoch*. The *Story of Ahikar* dates as early as 500 B.C. and is rather "the oldest extant book of world-literature" (Eduard Meyer) than a book of Judaism. The *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* is a newly discovered Hebrew document of which we are glad to have an edition by Dr. Charles, but its date and significance remain as yet quite uncertain. The *Pirke Aboth* is a tractate of the Mishna, which is the fundamental text of the Talmud and the primary document of rabbinical Judaism. It is right to include it in a source-book of Judaism, but its inclusion opens the door into a large place. These three books, in fact, might well belong to a third volume of selections from Hebrew and Aramaic sources.

But is the collection of Pseudepigrapha proper complete? If Pseudo-Aristeas is included, why not Pseudo-Hecataeus (fragments) and Pseudo-Phocylides? With the *Wisdom of Solomon* and *IV Maccabees*, why not also the fragments of the early Hellenistic Jewish historians, apologists, poets, and philosophers? A translation of the texts printed by W. N. Stearns, *Fragments from Grecian Jewish Writers*, would occupy only a few pages, and their importance is not to be questioned.

It is natural that Charles should be partial to the apocalyptic and legendary literature to which he has devoted his life. He says that in the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era, the apocalypses "almost alone represented the advance of the higher theology in Judaism, which culminated in Christianity"; and speaks of "their immeasurable value as being practically the only historical memorials of the religious development of Judaism from 200 B.C. to 100 A.D., and particularly of the development of that side of Judaism to which, historically, Christendom in large measure owes its existence." Now there are some, Dr. James Drummond for example, who esteem very highly the religious significance of Philo. Others, especially Jewish scholars, emphasize the ethical and spiritual elements in the teachings of the rabbis. Charles finds that "the ethical element is the fundamental element in the chief books of this [apocalyptic] literature," and that the ethical element present also in Talmudic literature "somehow lacks the fire and inspiration that distinguish it in the Pseudepigrapha." In fact, ethical and spiritual religion is to be found in apocalypses like *Enoch* and *Ezra*, in Philo, and in the haggada of the rabbis, and in all three it is burdened and perverted by other things; in the apocalypses by curious speculations about the mysteries of heaven and earth and

of the future; in Philo by ingenious searchings after hidden meanings in every letter of Scripture; in the rabbinical literature by the anxious effort to hedge about every minute precept of the law with additional protective restrictions. In all three, ethical and spiritual religion was hampered and confined by the belief in the inviolable canon of Holy Scripture and in the chosen and peculiar people, Israel. Christianity received spiritual and ethical instruction and impulse from all sides, and inherited in a measure, with all its freedom, all these sorts of burdens and restrictions. Whether those of the apocalyptic type, or those of allegorism, or those of literalism and externality, were the more dangerous and harmful is a question of impression.

Important as the apocalyptical element in the New Testament is and indispensable as are the Jewish apocalypses for a historical understanding of this element, I cannot, for myself, assent to the opinion that the Book of Enoch is the most important Jewish book written between 200 B.C. and 100 A.D., because by its spiritualizing of the messianic hope it made the rise of Christianity possible.¹ The line that reaches from prophecy to Christianity does not run so straight through Daniel and Enoch. It is true that Christians early appropriated and developed the apocalyptical ideas of Judaism; but the Judaism to which Jesus attached himself was that of John the Baptist; and John was not an apocalyptist, but, as his contemporaries saw, a prophet of a far more ancient and a very different type, the type of Elijah, the type of Amos. That, in part, foreign influences, especially Persian, diverted Jewish prophecy into apocalyptical lines, and that Christianity was in part a revival of the native Jewish prophetic spirit, seems at least to state a part of the truth. But if it is a mistake to make one's historical approach to Christianity exclusively along the line of the apocalypse, it is equally a mistake to suppose that the apocalyptical stream is, in the year 70, or 100, or 135, wholly diverted from Judaism into Christianity. Perhaps Charles does not mean to leave that impression. Akiba and his associates were both legalistic rabbis and apocalyptists; and the Talmud contains evidence that apocalyptical ideas were current through the centuries between the New Testament age and the revival of Hebrew apocalyptical writing in the Middle Ages. The apocalypse did not create Christianity, nor did the desertion of it change Judaism into a purely legalistic religion. But it is of course true that the influence, for better and for worse, of the Jewish apocalypse upon primitive Christianity was deep-going and far-reaching. The possibility of such an

¹ Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 2d ed., pp. vi, cviii.

interpretation of Jesus and of Paul as Schweitzer's is proof enough of the importance of a constant study of this literature.

Returning to the work before us, even if we regard it as meant especially to gather up the literature of the apocalypse, and enable the student to trace all the lines of connection it contains between Judaism and Christianity, we may still express the wish for somewhat more than is given. Schürer could safely have been followed to the extent of including the Apocalypse of Abraham, the Paralipomena Jeremiae (Rest of the Words of Baruch), the fragments of lost works preserved in citations by the church Fathers, the Pseudo-Philonic *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, which is one of the "one or two" omissions which Charles explains as due to the lack as yet of a critical edition of the text.

The student of apocalyptic literature needs in fact to make his beginning long before the Books of Daniel and Enoch, and to continue his studies, in Jewish and Christian books alike, well down into the Christian era. There are two contrasts that we are especially interested to understand. One is that between the national hope of Israel, which even at its highest belongs to this world, and the cosmic eschatology of the apocalypse proper, centering in the contrast between this world and the world to come, supernaturalistic and other-worldly in character, dualistic in its foundation. Was the first always the popular, the second the exceptional or the theological form of the hope? Was the first native to Israel, and the second the effect of foreign influences? For the study of this problem the volumes before us furnish the most important documents, and many illuminating discussions. Compare, for example, the national hope of Sirach 36:1-17, or Psalms of Solomon, chap. 17, with the eschatology of Enoch, chaps. 37-71, or Assumption of Moses, chap. 10. Or compare the reaction of Jewish faith upon the destruction of Jerusalem in Baruch in the Apocrypha, with that of the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch. The other contrast that we need to trace and explain is that within the apocalyptic literature itself between the cosmic and historic eschatology that centers in a world-catastrophe and the world-renewal, and the eschatology that is concerned with the fortunes of individual souls, good and bad, after death, that is, with detailed accounts of the various rewards of heaven and punishments of hell. The apocalypses here printed, like the New Testament Apocalypse, are almost entirely of the former type. The Apocalypse of Peter, which early rivaled that of John in popularity, is the earliest Christian representative of the second sort. There are

indeed beginnings in Enoch (e.g., chaps. 22, 27, 102-4), and especially in IV Ezra, chap. 7. It would have been worth while, if possible, to include further materials bearing on the question of the sources, whether Jewish or heathen, whether oriental or Greek, of this later development of the apocalypse, which culminates for us in Dante. The Apocalypses of Elijah and Zechariah (Steindorff, 1899), and some eschatological sayings of the Talmud are important in this direction, and make it at least probable that Jewish apocalyptists had already received (from Greek Orphic cults, or from a common oriental source?) impulses in this new direction.

The ideal source-book of Judaism in the time of Christ might well extend its apocalyptic materials somewhat and then add a third volume of selections from rabbinical literature, and—how can we help adding?—a fourth, of selections from Philo and Josephus. But whatever criticism seems to be involved in these suggestions concerns what the volumes do not rather than what they do contain, and would not have been called for if it had not been for the unfortunate remark about “all the remaining extant non-canonical Jewish books,” and if the information needed to correct it had been given; if, instead of an argument for the greater value of the pseudepigraphic literature as compared with the rabbinic, the Introduction had contained a complete review, however summary, of all the known literary products of Judaism during this period, those extant and those known only by title or citation, beginning with the latest parts of the Old Testament and including all the rabbinical writings which may contain traditions from the first two Christian centuries; so that the place and relative importance of the books here given would have been clear.

For what these volumes offer we may well be grateful and proud, for they constitute a notable achievement of English scholarship. Our space quite prohibits the effort to describe in detail the treatment of each of the thirty or more books and the work of each of the twenty-eight contributors. That the work is not all of equal excellence is inevitable, but it is careful and thorough work throughout. The introductions include discussions of the theological and ethical teachings of the books, and of their influence. An elaborate index helps the student to trace out special subjects, though it cannot of course take the place of the consecutive reading of the books themselves. Questions of date and place cannot always—indeed in this literature cannot often—be answered with certainty. Literary analysis can easily proceed too fast and too confidently. We know that both stories and

apocalypses are subject to constant changes with change of place and time and circumstance. But necessary as analysis sometimes is, it is well to remember that some one or some circle put the book together as it lies before us, and that it was used about as it is by many generations of people who did not notice or did not mind the inconsistencies between its different parts. Perhaps the books as they are represent the average Jew, whom we want to know, better than any of their component parts.

Certainly these books are good and useful to read, as Jerome and Luther agree in affirming of the Apocrypha proper, good not only for "furtherance of the knowledge of the history," but also "for example of life and instruction of manners." It is an illuminating and fascinating occupation to compare the wisdom of Jesus ben Sirā with the Old Testament proverbial literature on the one side, and with the wisdom of Jesus of Nazareth on the other; to study the interaction of Hebrew and Greek ethics and religion (of which we are ourselves the product) in the Wisdom of Solomon, and to compare the place of "Wisdom" in his religion with that of Christ and the Spirit in the religion of Paul; to compare with Paul's sense of sin and experience of the law that of the Ezra apocalypticist; to find the narrowness of Pharisaism in the Book of Jubilees, and its ideals and hopes amid trials in the Psalms of Solomon, and its joy in the law in Baruch or Aboth; to read in the Book of Enoch of the pre-existent Son of Man who is to judge the world; to trace in Enoch and Wisdom the beginnings of belief in the immortality of the spirit, in distinction from the more native Jewish idea of resurrection; above all to look for the sense of God and the heart of religion beneath varying and strange forms of expression, and to realize—perhaps to our surprise—how much depth of religious feeling and beauty and power of language is to be found in books to which the unfortunate and in part unfitting names *apocrypha* and *pseudepigrapha* have given the reputation of falsity and worthlessness. It is surely not too much to say that the student of the Old and New Testaments is in duty bound to acquaint himself with this extra-canonical literature, and that it is indispensable to the proper pursuit of his task. For the texts themselves, in English form, and for the study of their place and meaning, these two volumes must for a long while maintain their place as the standard edition.

FRANK C. PORTER

YALE UNIVERSITY